UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,411	02/12/2002	Roger Eastvold	390P010777-US (PAR)	7013

7590 05/06/2005

Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.
PERMAN & GREEN, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER	
PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,411	EASTVOLD, ROGER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashok B. Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/3/2002*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application Number 10/074, 411 was filed on 02/12/2002. Claims 1-18 are subject to examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities. Appropriate correction is required.

a. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. "CUSTOMER SUPPORT NETWORK FOR REMOTELY REQUESTING TEST DATA"

b. In accordance with the specification page 8, Fig. 1 should include numeral 10. Numeral 10 is missing in Fig. 1.

c. In Fig. 5 the interface is shown as being "COBRA", however, the interface on page 17 of the specification is described as being "CORBA."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 10 and 12 recite the limitation "the third network", "the second network", and "the first network" and "the third network" respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Regarding claim 1, the phrase "may or may not" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-12 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thibault et al. (hereinafter Thibault) (US 6, 799, 195 B1)

Referring to claim 1,

The reference teaches a system for accessing data remotely from a network (Fig.1), comprising:

a first network interface card permitting data transfer between a local network and an intermediate network (Fig.1, element 25b);

a second network interface card permitting data transfer between intermediate network and a remote network (Fig.1, element 20) ; and

a module located within the intermediate network, through which all data transferring between the first network and the third network must pass (Fig.1, element 25a, col. 5, lines 62 through col. 6, line 8);

wherein information transmitted by the remote network may or may not be received and acted upon by the local network depending on a set of predetermined criteria applied by the intermediate network (col. 8, line 19-27).

Referring to claim 4,

The reference teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the module exchanges data with an equipment diagnostic monitor system located within the intermediate network, and wherein the equipment diagnostic monitor system has the function of monitoring tests performed on at least one tool residing within the local network. (col. 8, line 38-65)

Referring to claim 5,

The reference teaches the system of claim 4, wherein the equipment diagnostic monitor system collects and analyzes data from tests performed on the at least tool. (col. 6, lines 18-24, lines 42-49, col. 8, line 38-65)

Referring to claim 6,

The reference teaches a system for accessing a local network from a remote network through an intermediate network (Fig. 1), comprising:

a first network interface card permitting data transfer between the local network and the intermediate network (Fig.1, element 25b);

a second network interface card permitting data transfer between the remote network and the intermediate network (Fig.1, element 20);

a module located within the intermediate network, through which all data transferring between the local network and the remote network must pass (Fig.1, element 25a, col. 5, lines 62 through col. 6, line 8); and

an equipment diagnostic monitor system located within the intermediate network, wherein the equipment diagnostic monitor system monitors tests performed on at least one item residing within the local network (col. 8, line 19-27).

Referring to claim 9,

The reference teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the equipment diagnostic monitor system collects and analyzes data from the tests performed on the at least one item. (col. 6, lines 18-24, lines 42-49, col. 8, line 38-65)

Referring to claim 10,

The reference teaches the system of claim 6, wherein a user on the second network may request that tests be performed on the at least one item, and may upload data to the remote network, from the tests performed on the at least one item. (col. 5, lines 62 through col. 6, line 25)

Referring to claim 11,

The reference teaches a data system, comprising:

a first network interface device enabling data transfer between a local network and an intermediate network (Fig.1, element 25b);;

a second network interface device enabling data transfer between a remote network and the intermediate network (Fig.1, element 20); and

an equipment diagnostic monitor system located within the intermediate network, wherein the equipment diagnostic monitor system monitors tests performed on at least one item in the local network (col. 8, line 38-65).

Referring to claim 12,

The reference teaches the system of claim 11, further comprising a module located within the third network, through which all data transferring between the first network and the third network must pass (Fig.1, element 25a, col. 5, lines 62 through col. 6, line 8).

Referring to claim 15,

The reference teaches the system of claim 11, wherein the equipment diagnostic monitor system collects and analyzes data from tests performed on the at least one item.(col. 6, lines 18-24, lines 42-49, col. 8, line 38-65).

Referring to claim 16,

The reference teaches the system of claim 11, wherein a user on the remote network may request that tests be performed on the at least one tool, and upload data from previous tests performed on the at least one item, and said request may be optionally executed or ignored based on a set of predetermined criteria. (col. 8, line 19-27, col. 5, lines 62 through col. 6, line 25)

Referring to claim 17,

The reference teaches the system of claim 11, wherein a user on the remote network may send a suggestion regarding the operation of the at least one item being monitored to an entity managing the item on the local network. (col. 8, line 19-27, col. 5, lines 62 through col. 6, line 25, col. 5, lines 62 through col. 6, line 25).

Referring to claim 18,

The reference teaches the system of claim 11, wherein the equipment diagnostic monitor system sends an alert to a predetermined entity when the analysis of tool data indicates that the item is operating outside of a predetermined performance range. (col. 3, lines 5-13)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thibault et al. (hereinafter Thibault) (US 6, 799, 195 B1) in view of Reid et al. (hereinafter Reid)(US 6, 182, 226 B1)

Referring to claims 2 and 3,

Keeping in mine the teachings of the reference as stated above, the reference explicitly fails to teach the system of claim 1, wherein the data transfer between each of the networks occurs via the Internet Protocol (IP), and wherein each network has its own unique IP address, and the system of claim 2, wherein the module hides the IP addresses of the remote network and the local network from each other.

The reference Reid teaches "A rewrite node is a point in an access rule where source or destination addresses are mapped to other source or destination addresses. Destination IP address rewrites allow an inbound connection through network address translation (NAT) address hiding to be remapped to a destination inside the NAT barrier. Source address rewrites can be used on outbound connections to make the source appear to be one of many external addresses. This process allows the internal hosts to be aliased to external addresses. Rewrites can be based on any connection criteria, including users.", col. 6, lines 46-56. (wherein the data transfer between each of the networks occurs via the Internet Protocol (IP), and wherein each network has its own unique IP address, and the system of claim 2, wherein the module hides the IP addresses of the remote network and the local network from each other.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to add the teachings of the reference Reid to the Server Digital Data processor of the reference Thibault such that address rewrites for inbound and outbound can be implemented based on any connection criteria, including users.

It would have been obvious because it provides a method for controlling interactions between networks by the use of firewalls with defined regions as taught by Reid.

Referring to claims 7 and 8,

Keeping in mine the teachings of the reference as stated above, the reference explicitly fails to teach the system of claim 6, wherein the data transfer between each of the networks occurs via the Internet Protocol (IP), and the system of claim 7, wherein the

module hides the IP addresses of the local network and the remote network from each other.

The reference Reid teaches "A rewrite node is a point in an access rule where source or destination addresses are mapped to other source or destination addresses. Destination IP address rewrites allow an inbound connection through network address translation (NAT) address hiding to be remapped to a destination inside the NAT barrier. Source address rewrites can be used on outbound connections to make the source appear to be one of many external addresses. This process allows the internal hosts to be aliased to external addresses. Rewrites can be based on any connection criteria, including users.", col. 6, lines 46-56. (wherein the data transfer between each of the networks occurs via the Internet Protocol (IP), and wherein each network has its own unique IP address, and the system of claim 2, wherein the module hides the IP addresses of the remote network and the local network from each other.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to add the teachings of the reference Reid to the Server Digital Data processor of the reference Thibault such that address rewrites for inbound and outbound can be implemented based on any connection criteria, including users.

It would have been obvious because it provides a method for controlling interactions between networks by the use of firewalls with defined regions as taught by Reid.

Referring to claims 13 and 14,

Keeping in mine the teachings of the reference as stated above, the reference explicitly fails to teach the system of claim 12, wherein data transfer between each of the networks occurs via the Internet Protocol (IP), and the system of claim 13, wherein the module hides the IP addresses of the local network and the remote network from each other.

The reference Reid teaches "A rewrite node is a point in an access rule where source or destination addresses are mapped to other source or destination addresses. Destination IP address rewrites allow an inbound connection through network address translation (NAT) address hiding to be remapped to a destination inside the NAT barrier. Source address rewrites can be used on outbound connections to make the source appear to be one of many external addresses. This process allows the internal hosts to be aliased to external addresses. Rewrites can be based on any connection criteria, including users.", col. 6, lines 46-56. (wherein the data transfer between each of the networks occurs via the Internet Protocol (IP), and wherein each network has its own unique IP address, and the system of claim 2, wherein the module hides the IP addresses of the remote network and the local network from each other.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to add the teachings of the reference Reid to the Server Digital Data processor of the reference Thibault such that address rewrites for inbound and outbound can be implemented based on any connection criteria, including users.

It would have been obvious because it provides a method for controlling interactions between networks by the use of firewalls with defined regions as taught by Reid.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp
***